

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1998
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

- S004725 People, Respondent
Crim. v.
25694 Royal Kenneth Hayes, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including April 22, 1998.
- S020161 People, Respondent
v.
Tauno Waidla, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including April 24, 1998.
- S023628 People, Respondent
v.
John Sapp, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including April 23, 1998.
- S050843 In re Pedro Arias
on
Habeas Corpus
On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file response to appellant's letter brief is extended to and including March 25, 1998.
- S061215 Cates Construction, Inc. et al., Appellants
v.
Talbot Partners et al., Respondents
And Companion Case
The application of the National Bond Claim Association for permission to file an amicus curiae brief in support of appellant TIG Insurance Company is hereby granted.
Parties' respective consolidated answers to amicus curiae briefs may be served and filed within twenty days of the filing of the brief.

S061215 Cates Construction, Inc. et al., Appellants

v.

Talbot Partners et al., Respondents

And Companion Case

The application of Amwest Surety Insurance Company for permission to file an amicus curiae brief in support of appellant TIG Insurance Company is hereby granted.

Parties' respective consolidated answers to amicus curiae briefs may be served and filed within twenty days of the filing of the brief.

S064118 People, Respondent

v.

Caesar Augustus Lopez, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's answer brief on the merits is extended to and including April 21, 1998.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S065479 In re Ronald Anthony Jones

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including April 20, 1998.

S067060 Kay Delaney, Respondent

v.

Calvin Baker et al., Appellants

On application of appellants and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellants' opening brief on the merits is extended to and including April 27, 1998.

S018634 People, Respondent

v.

Isaac Gutierrez, Jr., Appellant

The application of appellant to file an over-lengthy reply brief is granted.

S021683 People, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

Ronald Anthony Jones, Defendant and Appellant

In the above-entitled matter the court filed its decision on January 29, 1998, because of the following circumstances:

1. The size of the record on appeal, totaling approximately 4,332 pages of clerk's transcript and 4,371 pages of reporter's transcript.

2. The need to grant appellant, for good cause, four extensions of time within which to submit his briefs.

3. The need to grant respondent, for good cause, two extensions of time within which to submit their briefs.

4. The need to consider supplemental authorities submitted by both parties at the court's request. The last of these was not submitted until November 3, 1997.

5. The number and complexity of the issues raised on appeal and the extensiveness of the parties' briefing.

6. The judges' various viewpoints, reflected in part in the two filed opinions.

1st Dist. Artichoke Industries, Inc.

A081190 v.

WCAB, Josefina Regalado

The above-entitled matter, now pending in the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District.

S067244 In re **Keith G. Liggins** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Keith G. Liggins** be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he makes restitution to Hans Reichenbach, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$1,028, plus 10% interest per annum from November 8, 1994; to Hans Reichenbach, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$2,042 plus 10% interest per annum from March 7, 1995; to Hans Reichenbach, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$1,628 plus 10% interest per annum from May 1, 1995; to Dr. Joni A. Forge, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$2,000, plus 10% interest per annum from July 6, 1993; to Re/Max Real Estate Specialists, Trudy Briscoe and their attorney, Wayne S. Kreger of Engstrom, Lipscomb & Lack, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$1,050 plus 10% interest per annum from August 12, 1994; to Sherlock Holmes Inspections, Roy

Salamun and their attorney Theodore B. Zinger, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$564, plus 10% interest per annum from September 22, 1994, to Sherlock Holmes Inspections, Roy Salamun and their attorney Theodore B. Zinger, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$314, plus 10% interest per annum from February 9, 1995; to General Motors Acceptance Corporation and its attorneys, Danner & Martyn, LLP, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$974 plus 10% interest per annum from August 3, 1995, to General Motors Acceptance Corporation and its attorneys, Danner & Martyn, LLP, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$414 plus 10% interest per annum from May 7, 1996; to Fidelis Agwamba, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$300, plus 10% interest per annum from October 2, 1996 and to William S. Randall, Kathryn L. Randall and their attorney, Kenneth S. Kleeger of Prestholt, Petak, Kleeger, Fidone & Villasenor, or the Client Security Fund if appropriate, in the amount of \$687.50, plus 10% interest per annum from September 29, 1995, and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of Trials, and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehailitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension by stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including 90 days actual suspension. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order regarding the Stipulation filed November 18, 1997. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year or within the period of actual suspension, whichever is later, after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn 8.) Costs are to be awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.10 and those costs are payable in accordance with section 6140.7 (as amended effective January 1, 1997).

S067245 In re **Karen Rucker** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Karen Rucker** be disbarred from the practice of law and that her name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. **Karen Rucker** is also ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days,

respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067246 In re **Barry Ray Smith** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Barry Ray Smith** be disbarred from the practice of law and that her name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. **Barry Ray Smith** is also ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067247 In re **Courtney L. Tippin** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Courtney L. Tippin** be disbarred from the practice of law and that her name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. She is also ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067251 In re **Richard Saavedra** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Richard Saavedra** be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended from sixty days and until he makes restitution to Salvador and Carolyn Mendoza in the amount of \$1,000 plus 10% interest per annum from October 1, 1995 and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of Trials and until he returns all original documents to Jack and Jean Sweeney and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of Trials. If the period of actual suspension is 90 days, it is ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* If the period of actual suspension exceeds two years, Respondent shall remain

actually suspended until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed October 23, 1997. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or within the period of actual suspension, whichever is later. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.10 and those costs are payable in accordance with section 6140.7 (as amended effective January 1, 1997).

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067254 In re **Alfonso A. Oliva** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Alfonso A. Oliva** be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. He is also ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067259 In re **Paul Michael Gray** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Paul Michael Gray** be suspended from the practice of law for five years, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for 42 months and until he makes restitution to Eugenie Gosling (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate), in the amount of \$25,000.00, plus 10% interest per annum from September 25, 1994, and provides satisfactory evidence thereof to the Probation Unit, Office of Trials, Los Angeles; and until he makes restitution to Cecilia Hageman (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate), in the amount of \$1,140.00, plus 10% interest per annum from October 19, 1995, and provides satisfactory evidence thereof to the Probation Unit, Office of Trials, Los Angeles; and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the

general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. He is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed September 26, 1997, as modified by its order filed October 28, 1997. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn 8.) He is further ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6140.7 as amended effective January 1, 1997.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067260 In re **Scott Anthony Bladek** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Scott Anthony Bladek** be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. **Scott Anthony Bladek** is also ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S067261 In re **Frederick Michael Walker** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Frederick Michael Walker** be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

S068619 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Raymond W. Noonan**
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Raymond W. Noonan** as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against him should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.* Costs are

awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S068620 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Robert Woodrow Ball**
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Robert Woodrow Ball** as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against him should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S068621 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Charles G. Page**
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Charles G. Page** as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against him should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S068622 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Roderick G. Bouyer**
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Roderick G. Bouyer** as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against him should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)